

ATTN: GERMAINE LARCOMBE

Cliff Owen

From: Cliff Owen [REDACTED]
To: 'Fees'
Subject: RE: Cost Recovery Information Session and Workshop 26th October 2018
Manjimup

26th October 2018	
Department of Water and Environmental Regulation	
File Ref	
16 NOV 2018	
Doc Ref	
Div/Officer	
Scanned?	Y N

To whom it may concern,
From [REDACTED]

My Internet service is down and has been down for near on a week.
I'm not sure how I will be able to get this submission to the DWER's "cost of recovery discussion".
If it gets to the department before cut of time I wish it to be considered.
My comments will only cover the 'Water side of the discussion.

Firstly, I agree that the country's limited water needs a department to regulate the usage so that unscrupulous use is avoided.

Hence,

----- this dept. needs to know how much water we have, how quick it is replenished both surface and sub ground.

----- we also need to know how much is being used.

----- how much is lost to use through 'mans' poor practices,
eg salt degradation of land due to over clearing and the following increasing salinity of the rivers,
destruction of artesian supplies through such practices as over use.
fracking. and, by way of comment, for anyone to suggest that the 'aquifers don't, eventually mix' must be

living

in fairyland.

----- water is a public commodity and as such costs should be bourn 100 % by the whole community." Without
it we

----- die With it live.

The above stated would seem to be obvious, however from the forum presented at Manjimup this would not be seen to be the case.

The fait accompli manner in which the case for cost recovery was presented left the VICTIMS with the feeling that they were going to be Taxed again, even though the government said there would be no more taxes.
The options being that the victim could choose between "The devil and the deep blue sea".

If DWER is running out of funds let them do what the 'farmer' has to do when finances are short.
He/she has to look at expenditure and cut out that which is not producing, they get more efficient, they cut out the 'dead' wood. This analogy should not need further explanation.

There is a false premise that the farmer is the major beneficiary of the water used. The major beneficiary of the water is the consumer of the produce.

It would seem to be necessary to point out that the farmer has already paid taxes on his water use systems from the primary produced dollar. i.e tax on the machinery used, fuel consumed, labour, road taxes, and the list goes on.

Is it also necessary to point out that the Billions of dollar spent on desalination was paid for by all tax payers and yet it is the cities that consume the desalinated water with no rebate given to The Country Tax Payer.

Kind regards
[REDACTED]